

### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims are being amended. Claims 1-17 remain pending in this application, of which claims 10-13 are withdrawn from consideration.

#### *Allowable subject matter*

Applicant appreciates the indication that claim 4 is allowed, and that claims 5, 15 and 17 contain allowable subject matter.

#### *Drawing objections*

The drawings were objected to. Specifically, the Office Action stated:

The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “second surface structure function having characteristics to provide additional diffusion to the light incident on the substrate” of claims 1, 4, 14 and the “second surface structure function provides that the at least one prism has a bowed shape” of claim 6 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).

Applicant respectfully traverses this objection to the drawings. The claimed features of the claims are shown in the drawing as further described in the specification. For example, claim 1 recites “each of the at least one prism structures having a first surface characterized by a first surface structure function modulated by a second surface structure function, the first surface structure function having characteristics to provide that each of the at least one prism structures has a cross section with at least two curved sides to provide defocusing diffusion to light incident on the substrate, both the first surface structure function and the second surface structure function encompassing the two curved sides, the second surface structure function having characteristics to provide additional diffusion to the light incident on the substrate.” The first surface of claim 1 characterized by the first surface structure function modulated by the second surface structure function is shown for example in FIG. 21 which illustrates a facet 100 with both a “bowed” shape and a curved cross section. As explained in paragraph [0042] of the specification, the curved sidewalls provide a defocusing function and thus provide the defocusing aspect of the first surface structure function. The bowing provides additional

diffusing light and thus corresponds to the second surface structure function. The specification also provides further details of embodiments of the second surface structure function in paragraphs [0063] and [0064], for example.

With respect to claim 6, FIG. 21 illustrates “bowing”.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103***

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,280,063 to Fong et al. (Fong). Claims 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fong in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,460 to Ookawa et al. (Ookawa). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites:

An optical substrate comprising:

at least one prism structure, each of the at least one prism structures having a first surface characterized by a first surface structure function modulated by a second surface structure function, the first surface structure function having characteristics to provide that each of the at least one prism structures has a cross section with at least two curved sides to provide defocusing diffusion to light incident on the substrate, *both the first surface structure function and the second surface structure function encompassing the two curved sides*, the second surface structure function having characteristics to provide additional diffusion to the light incident on the substrate.

Fong fails to disclose at least the above italicized feature in the context of claim 1, where the first and second surface structure functions are as recited in claim 1.

Fong discloses a brightness enhancement article 30 in FIG. 2. The article 30 has a pair of opposed surfaces 34 and 36. Surface 34 has a series of protruding light-diffusing elements 38 (col. 3, lines 58-60), while surface 36 features an array of linear prisms having blunted or rounded peaks 40 (col. 3, lines 61-63).

Fong, however, does not disclose “both the first surface structure function and the second surface structure function encompassing the two curved sides”, where the curved sides

are the curved sides of the cross section of the prism structures. The Office Action equates the prisms with the blunted or rounded peaks 40, and the surface 34 of Fong with the first and second surface structure functions, respectively, as recited in claim 1. The prisms with rounded peaks 40, however, are on the surface 36, which opposes the surface 34 having the light-diffusing elements 38. The light-diffusing elements 38 are thus not on the same surface as the prisms 40. Thus, the light-diffusing elements 38 do not encompass the curved sides of the cross sections of the prisms 40, and Fong does not disclose “both the first surface structure function and the second surface structure function encompassing the two curved sides” as recited in claim 1.

Ookawa was cited for allegedly disclosing other features of the claims, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Fong.

Independent claim 14 recites “at least one prism structure, each of the at least one prism structures having a first surface characterized by a first surface structure function modulated by a second surface structure function, the first surface function having characteristics to provide that each of the at least one prism structure has a cross section with at least two curved sides to provide defocusing diffusion to light incident on the substrate, both the first surface structure function and the second surface structure function encompassing the two curved sides, the second surface structure function having characteristics to provide additional diffusion to the light incident on the substrate” and thus is patentable over Fong for reasons analogous to claim 1.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims as well as for further patentable features recited therein.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 20, 2007

By Michael D. Kaminski

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5490  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Michael D. Kaminski  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 32,904

Thomas G. Bilodeau  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 43,438